. PATENT COOPERATION 1 EATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY To: WRITTEN OPINION OF THE see form PCT/ISA/220 INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet) Applicant's or agent's file reference FOR FURTHER ACTION see form PCT/ISA/220 See paragraph 2 below International application No. Priority date (day/month/year) International filing date (day/month/year) PCT/B2004/003366 04.10.2004 02.10.2003 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC C08B37/00, A61K39/095, A61K31/715 Applicant **CHIRON SRL** This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion ☐ Box No. II **Priority** ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. **FURTHER ACTION** If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Name and mailing address of the ISA: **Authorized Officer**

European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465 Authorized Office

Radke, M

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-8677



101574437

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IB2004/003366

IAP20 RECUTCIVETO US APR 2006

	Ba	w No	I Pools of the guidan	
	ВО	x No	. I Basis of the opinion	
1.	. With regard to the language , this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.			
This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language language, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of intern (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).				ng
2.	Wit	With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:		
	a. type of material:			Best Available
	1	□ a	a sequence listing	
	l	□ t	able(s) related to the sequence listing	$\hat{\Omega}$
	b. format of material:		$\bar{\bar{Q}}$	
	(□ ii	n written format	O
	[□ iı	n complitor readable torm	
	c. ti	me o	f filing/furnishing:	Copy
	E	⊐ c	contained in the international application as filed.	S
	[⊐ fi	led together with the international application in computer readable form.	
	E	⊐ fı	urnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.	
3.	In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.			eto
4.	Additional comments:			

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-27

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-27

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-24, 26,27

No: Claims 25

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

PCT/IB2004/003366

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Cited literature

(a) Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: WO-A-03 007 985

D2: C. Jones et al., J. Pharm. Biomed. Anal. 30 (2002), 1233-1247

(b) In the following arguments, page or column A, lines B to C will be cited as A/B-C.

2. Novelty

(a) Document D1 discloses at 16/19-18/10 the separate hydrolysis of serogroup W135 and Y meningococcal capsular polysaccharides, the introduction of a primary amino group into each of these polysaccharides by reaction with NH₄Cl and NaCNBH₃ and the conjugation with CRM₁97.

The examples at 16/16-18/10 are identical with those at 24/1-34 of the present application. Consequently, the products of these examples of **D1** have the O-acetylation status as summarised in the tables on pages 25 and 26 of the present application.

Therefore, the subject-matter of <u>claims 1-13, 14 and 15</u> (see **D1**, 18/11-15), <u>16</u> (see **D1**, 12/10-12), <u>17-19</u> (see **D1**, 22/24-3 and the table on p. 26), <u>20</u> (see 6/13-14), <u>21</u> (see **D1**, 6/27-28), <u>22</u> (see **D1**, 6/23), <u>23</u> (see **D1**, 6/24-26, 7/18) <u>and 24-27</u> is not novel.

(b) Document **D2** discloses on (see p. 1237 in chapter 3.2 and Table 4 on p. 1245) the almost complete deacetylation of Y capsular polysaccharides. The products may be used in the manufacture of vaccines (see the abstract).

The subject-matter of claims 2-5, 9, 11, 24 and 25 thus is also not novel in view

of **D2**.

3. Inventive step

As the subject-matter of none of the claims is novel, there is no room for the assessment of inventive step.

4. Clarity of the claims

- (a) The word "about" blurs the ranges given in **claims 6 and 7** thus rendering these claims unclear.
- (b) <u>Claim 19</u> is inherently unclear. The respective sentence appears to be incomplete.

5. Industrial applicability

For the assessment of the present <u>claim 25</u> on the question whether they are industrially applicable, no unified criteria exist in the PCT Contracting States. The patentability can also be dependent upon the formulation of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognize as industrially applicable the subject-matter of claims to the use of a compound in medical treatment, but may allow, however, claims to a known compound for first use in medical treatment and the use of such a compound for the manufacture of a medicament for a new medical treatment.